

## Pelvic inflammatory disease

Search date May 2007

Jonathan Ross

### ABSTRACT

**INTRODUCTION:** Pelvic inflammatory disease is caused by infection of the upper female genital tract and is often asymptomatic. Pelvic inflammatory disease is the most common gynaecological reason for admission to hospital in the USA and is diagnosed in almost 2% of women aged 16 to 45 years consulting their GP in England and Wales. **METHODS AND OUTCOMES:** We conducted a systematic review and aimed to answer the following clinical questions: What are the effects of empirical treatment compared with treatment delayed until the results of microbiological investigations are known? How do different antimicrobial regimens compare? What are the effects of routine antibiotic prophylaxis to prevent pelvic inflammatory disease before intrauterine contraceptive device (IUD) insertion? We searched: Medline, Embase, The Cochrane Library, and other important databases up to May 2007 (Clinical Evidence reviews are updated periodically; please check our website for the most up-to-date version of this review). We included harms alerts from relevant organisations such as the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the UK Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA). **RESULTS:** We found nine systematic reviews, RCTs, or observational studies that met our inclusion criteria. We performed a GRADE evaluation of the quality of evidence for interventions. **CONCLUSIONS:** In this systematic review, we present information relating to the effectiveness and safety of the following interventions: antibiotics (oral, parenteral, empirical treatment, treatment guided by test results, different durations, outpatient, inpatient), and routine antibiotic prophylaxis (before intrauterine device insertion in women at high risk or low risk).

### QUESTIONS

What are the effects of empirical treatment in women with suspected pelvic inflammatory disease compared with treatment delayed until the results of microbiological investigations are known? . . . . .	3
How do different antimicrobial regimens compare when treating women with confirmed pelvic inflammatory disease? . . . . .	3
What are the effects of routine antibiotic prophylaxis to prevent pelvic inflammatory disease before IUD insertion? . . . . .	1
	8

### INTERVENTIONS

#### TREATMENT: EMPIRICAL V POST-CULTURE

##### Unknown effectiveness

Empirical antibiotic treatment versus treatment guided by test results in women with suspected pelvic inflammatory disease . . . . . 3

#### TREATMENT: WHICH ANTIBIOTIC?

##### Likely to be beneficial

Antibiotics (for symptoms and microbiological clearance in women with confirmed pelvic inflammatory disease) . . . . . 3

Different durations of antibiotic treatment (no evidence as to which duration is best) . . . . . 17

Oral antibiotics (as effective as parenteral antibiotics) . . . . . 3

Outpatient (as effective as inpatient) antibiotic treatment . . . . . 17

#### ANTIBIOTIC PROPHYLAXIS BEFORE IUD

##### Unknown effectiveness

Routine antibiotic prophylaxis before IUD insertion in women at high risk . . . . . 18

##### Unlikely to be beneficial

Routine antibiotic prophylaxis before IUD insertion in women at low risk . . . . . 19

### Key points

- Pelvic inflammatory disease (PID) is caused by infection of the upper female genital tract, and is often asymptomatic. PID is the most common gynaecological reason for admission to hospital in the USA, and is diagnosed in almost 2% of women aged 16 to 45 years consulting their GP in England and Wales. Epithelial damage from infections such as *Chlamydia trachomatis* or *Neisseria gonorrhoeae* can allow opportunistic infection from many other bacteria. About 20% of women with PID become infertile, 40% develop chronic pain, and 1% of women who conceive have an ectopic pregnancy. Spontaneous resolution of symptoms may occur in some women, but early initiation of treatment is needed to prevent impairment of fertility.
- As there are no reliable signs and symptoms of PID, [empirical treatment](#) is common. The positive predictive value of clinical diagnosis is 65% to 90% compared with laparoscopy, and observational studies suggest that delaying treatment by 3 days can impair fertility. The absence of infection from the lower genital tract does not exclude a diagnosis of PID.

- **Oral antibiotics** are likely to be beneficial, and are associated with the resolution of symptoms and signs of pelvic infection, but we don't know which antibiotic regimen is best.

Clinical and microbiological cure rates of 88% to 100% have been reported after oral antibiotic treatment.

The risks of tubal occlusion and infertility depend on severity of infection before treatment. Clinical improvement may not necessarily translate into improved fertility.

- Oral antibiotics may be as effective as **parenteral antibiotics** in reducing symptoms and preserving fertility, with fewer adverse effects, and outpatient treatment is as effective as inpatient treatment for uncomplicated PID. However, we don't know the optimal **duration** of treatment.
- Risks of PID may be increased after instrumentation of the cervix, and testing for infection before such procedures is advisable, but we don't know whether **prophylactic antibiotics** before IUD insertion reduce these risks.

**DEFINITION** Pelvic inflammatory disease (PID) is inflammation and infection of the upper genital tract in women, typically involving the fallopian tubes, ovaries, and surrounding structures.

**INCIDENCE/ PREVALENCE** The exact incidence of PID is unknown, because the disease cannot be diagnosed reliably from clinical symptoms and signs. <sup>[1]</sup> <sup>[2]</sup> <sup>[3]</sup> Direct visualisation of the fallopian tubes by laparoscopy is the best single diagnostic test, but it is invasive, lacks sensitivity, and is not used routinely in clinical practice. PID is the most common gynaecological reason for admission to hospital in the USA, accounting for 18/10,000 recorded hospital discharges. <sup>[4]</sup> A diagnosis of PID is made in 1/62 (1.6%) women aged 16 to 45 years attending their primary-care physician in England and Wales. <sup>[5]</sup> However, because most PID is asymptomatic, this figure underestimates the true prevalence. <sup>[1]</sup> <sup>[6]</sup> A crude marker of PID in resource-poor countries can be obtained from reported hospital admission rates, where it accounts for 17% to 40% of gynaecological admissions in sub-Saharan Africa, 15% to 37% in Southeast Asia, and 3% to 10% in India. <sup>[7]</sup>

**AETIOLOGY/ RISK FACTORS** Factors associated with PID mirror those for STDs — young age, reduced socioeconomic circumstances, lower educational attainment, and recent new sexual partner. <sup>[2]</sup> <sup>[8]</sup> <sup>[9]</sup> Infection ascends from the cervix, and initial epithelial damage caused by bacteria (especially *Chlamydia trachomatis* and *Neisseria gonorrhoeae*) allows the opportunistic entry of other organisms. Many different microbes, including *Mycoplasma genitalium* and anaerobes, may be isolated from the upper genital tract. <sup>[10]</sup> <sup>[11]</sup> The spread of infection to the upper genital tract may be increased by instrumentation of the cervix, but reduced by barrier methods of contraception, levonorgestrel implants, and by oral contraceptives compared with other forms of contraception. <sup>[12]</sup> <sup>[13]</sup> <sup>[14]</sup> <sup>[15]</sup> <sup>[16]</sup>

**PROGNOSIS** PID has a high morbidity; about 20% of affected women become infertile, 40% develop chronic pelvic pain, and 1% of those who conceive have an ectopic pregnancy (see table 1, p 22). <sup>[17]</sup> <sup>[18]</sup> Uncontrolled observations suggest that clinical symptoms and signs resolve in a significant proportion of untreated women. <sup>[17]</sup> Repeated episodes of PID are associated with a four- to sixfold increase in the risk of permanent tubal damage. <sup>[19]</sup> One case control study (76 cases and 367 controls) found that delaying treatment by 3 or more days is associated with impaired fertility (OR 2.6, 95% CI 1.2 to 5.9). <sup>[20]</sup>

**AIMS OF INTERVENTION** To alleviate the pain and systemic malaise associated with infection; to achieve microbiological cure; to prevent development of permanent tubal damage with associated sequelae, such as chronic pelvic pain, ectopic pregnancy, and infertility; and to prevent the spread of infection to others, with minimal adverse effects.

**OUTCOMES** **Cure rate** (includes clinical cure rate; microbiological cure of the upper genital tract; resolution of acute symptoms and signs); **symptom severity** (includes reduction of chronic pelvic pain); **rate of ectopic pregnancy**; **fertility** (includes pregnancy [other than ectopic]); **rate of transmission to others**; **recurrence**; **quality of life**; and **adverse effects of treatment**; *in question on routine antibiotic prophylaxis: rate of PID.*

**METHODS** *Clinical Evidence* search May 2007. The following databases were used to identify studies for this systematic review: Medline 1966 to May 2007, Embase 1980 to May 2007, and The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Clinical Trials 2007, Issue 2. Additional searches were carried out using these websites: NHS Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) — for Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effects (DARE) and Health Technology Assessment (HTA), Turning Research into Practice (TRIP), and NICE. We also searched for retractions of studies included in the review. Abstracts of the studies retrieved from the initial search were assessed by an information specialist. Selected studies were then sent to the author for additional assessment, using predetermined criteria to identify relevant studies. Study-design criteria for inclusion in this review were: published systematic reviews and RCTs in any language,

at least single blinded, and containing more than 20 individuals of whom more than 80% were followed up. There was no minimum length of follow-up required to include studies. We excluded all studies described as “open”, “open label”, or not blinded unless blinding was impossible. We also searched for cohort studies on IUD insertion risk/harms. In addition we use a regular surveillance protocol to capture harms alerts from organisations such as the FDA and the UK Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA), which are added to the reviews as required. To aid readability of the numerical data in our reviews, we round many percentages to the nearest whole number. Readers should be aware of this when relating percentages to summary statistics such as relative risks (RRs) and odds ratios (ORs). We have performed a GRADE evaluation of the quality of evidence for interventions included in this review (see table, p 24). The categorisation of the quality of the evidence (high, moderate, low, or very low) reflects the quality of evidence available for our chosen outcomes in our defined populations of interest. These categorisations are not necessarily a reflection of the overall methodological quality of any individual study, because the Clinical Evidence population and outcome of choice may represent only a small subset of the total outcomes reported, and population included, in any individual trial. For further details of how we perform the GRADE evaluation and the scoring system we use, please see our website ([www.clinicalevidence.com](http://www.clinicalevidence.com)).

**QUESTION** What are the effects of empirical treatment in women with suspected pelvic inflammatory disease compared with treatment delayed until the results of microbiological investigations are known?

**OPTION** EMPIRICAL ANTIBIOTIC TREATMENT

- For GRADE evaluation of interventions for Pelvic inflammatory disease, see table, p 24.
- We found no clinically important results from RCTs about empirical antibiotic treatment (before receiving results of microbiological tests) compared with treatment guided by test results in women with suspected PID.
- As there are no reliable signs and symptoms of PID, empirical treatment is common.
- The positive predictive value of clinical diagnosis is 65% to 90% compared with laparoscopy, and observational studies suggest that delaying treatment by 3 days can impair fertility.

## Benefits and harms

**Empirical antibiotic treatment versus delayed treatment in women with suspected PID:**

We found no systematic review or RCTs comparing empirical versus delayed treatment (see comment).

## Further information on studies

### Comment:

#### Clinical guide:

Because there are no reliable clinical diagnostic criteria for pelvic inflammatory disease (PID), early empirical treatment is common.<sup>[3]</sup> The positive predictive value of a clinical diagnosis is 65% to 90% compared with laparoscopy.<sup>[1]</sup> <sup>[2]</sup> <sup>[3]</sup> The absence of infection from the lower genital tract, where samples are usually taken, does not exclude PID,<sup>[2]</sup> and so may not influence the decision to treat. One case control study (76 cases and 367 controls) found that delaying treatment by 3 or more days is associated with impaired fertility (OR 2.6, 95% CI 1.2 to 5.9).<sup>[20]</sup>

**QUESTION** How do different antimicrobial regimens compare when treating women with confirmed pelvic inflammatory disease?

**OPTION** ANTIBIOTICS (FOR SYMPTOMS AND MICROBIOLOGICAL CLEARANCE IN WOMEN WITH CONFIRMED PELVIC INFLAMMATORY DISEASE)

- For GRADE evaluation of interventions for Pelvic inflammatory disease, see table, p 24.
- There is consensus that antibiotic treatment is more effective than no treatment for women with confirmed PID.

## Benefits and harms

## Different antibiotics versus each other:

We found one systematic review (search date 2004, 34 RCTs, 3548 women) <sup>[21]</sup> and one subsequent RCT <sup>[22]</sup> assessing the effects of different antibiotic regimens in the treatment of pelvic inflammatory disease (PID). <sup>[21]</sup> The review assessed standard antibiotic regimens and non-standard regimens; see table 2, p 22 for “standard” and non-standard regimens as defined by the review. <sup>[21]</sup> The review identified no RCTs comparing standard or non-standard regimens versus placebo (see comment).









## Cure rate

*Different antibiotics compared with each other* We don't know how different antibiotic regimens compare with each other at improving cure rates in women with confirmed pelvic inflammatory disease (PID) (very low-quality evidence).

Ref (type)	Population	Outcome, Interventions	Results and statistical analysis	Effect size	Favours
<b>Cure rate</b>					
<sup>[23]</sup> RCT	33 women In review <sup>[21]</sup> See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 15/15 (100%) with ofloxacin (oral then iv) plus metronidazole 7/18 (39%) with clindamycin plus gentamicin	RR 1.06 95% CI 0.95 to 1.18 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor	↔	Not significant
<sup>[24]</sup> RCT	115 women In review <sup>[21]</sup> See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 46/55 (84%) with cefoxitin plus doxycycline 52/60 (87%) with clindamycin plus gentamicin	RR 0.97 95% CI 0.83 to 1.12 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor	↔	Not significant
<sup>[25]</sup> RCT	198 women In review <sup>[21]</sup> See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 75/94 (80%) with cefoxitin plus doxycycline 87/104 (84%) with clindamycin plus gentamicin	RR 0.95 95% CI 0.84 to 1.09 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor	↔	Not significant
<sup>[26]</sup> RCT	130 women In review <sup>[21]</sup> See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 64/67 (96%) with cefoxitin plus doxycycline 57/63 (90%) with clindamycin plus gentamicin	RR 1.06 95% CI 0.96 to 1.16 Overall effect size RR 1.01 95% CI 0.93 to 1.08 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor	↔	Not significant
<sup>[27]</sup> RCT	131 women In review <sup>[21]</sup> See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 49/64 (77%) with ceftriaxone plus doxycycline 57/67 (85%) with ciprofloxacin plus clindamycin	RR 0.90 95% CI 0.76 to 1.07 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor	↔	Not significant
<sup>[28]</sup> RCT	148 women In review <sup>[21]</sup> See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 73/75 (97%) with cefoxitin plus doxycycline 70/73 (96%) with clindamycin plus tobramycin	RR 1.02 95% CI 0.96 to 1.08 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor	↔	Not significant

Ref (type)	Population	Outcome, Interventions	Results and statistical analysis	Effect size	Favours
[29] RCT	249 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 75/121 (62%) with cefoxitin plus probenecid plus doxycycline 80/128 (63%) with ofloxacin	RR 0.99 95% CI 0.82 to 1.20 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor	↔	Not significant
[30] RCT	62 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 30/31 (97%) with cefoxitin plus doxycycline 28/31 (90%) with clindamycin plus amikacin	RR 1.07 95% CI 0.94 to 1.22 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor	↔	Not significant
[31] RCT	79 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 38/40 (95%) with cefoxitin plus doxycycline 36/39 (92%) with clindamycin plus tobramycin	RR 1.03 95% CI 0.98 to 1.08 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor	↔	Not significant
[32] RCT	72 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 34/35 (97%) with cefoxitin plus probenecid plus doxycycline 35/37 (95%) with ofloxacin	RR 1.03 95% CI 0.93 to 1.13 Overall effect size RR 1.02 95% CI 0.97 to 1.06 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor	↔	Not significant
[33] RCT	25 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 13/15 (87%) with clindamycin plus gentamicin 10/10 (100%) with ciprofloxacin	RR 0.87 95% CI 0.71 to 1.06 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor	↔	Not significant
[34] RCT	76 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 38/40 (95%) with clindamycin plus gentamicin 33/36 (92%) with ceftazidime plus doxycycline	RR 1.04 95% CI 0.92 to 1.17 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor	↔	Not significant
[35] RCT	68 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 34/35 (97%) with clindamycin plus gentamicin 33/33 (100%) with ciprofloxacin (plus clindamycin in one women)	RR 0.97 95% CI 0.92 to 1.03 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor	↔	Not significant
[36] RCT	84 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 40/40 (100%) with clindamycin plus gentamicin 41/44 (93%) with meropenem	RR 1.07 95% CI 0.99 to 1.16 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor	↔	Not significant

Ref (type)	Population	Outcome, Interventions	Results and statistical analysis	Effect size	Favours
[37] RCT	13 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 8/8 (100%) with clindamycin plus gentamicin 5/5 (100%) with aztreonam plus clindamycin	Significance not assessed The review reported that overall trial quality was poor		
[38] RCT	77 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 39/40 (98%) with clindamycin plus gentamicin plus doxycycline 37/37 (100%) with imipenem plus cilastin (plus doxycycline in some women)	RR 0.98 95% CI 0.93 to 1.02 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor	↔	Not significant
[39] RCT	58 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 21/29 (72%) with clindamycin plus gentamicin 23/29 (79%) with cefotaxime	RR 0.91 95% CI 0.68 to 1.22 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor	↔	Not significant
[40] RCT	30 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 14/14 (100%) with clindamycin plus gentamicin 15/16 (94%) with ciprofloxacin	RR 0.98 95% CI 0.90 to 1.07 Overall effect size RR 1.00 95% CI 0.96 to 1.04 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor	↔	Not significant
[41] RCT	81 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 10/42 (24%) with amoxicillin/clavulanate 9/39 (25%) with amoxicillin plus aminoglycoside plus metronidazole	RR 1.03 95% CI 0.47 to 2.27 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor	↔	Not significant
[42] RCT	20 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 2/10 (20%) with ampicillin plus metronidazole 10/10 (100%) with doxycycline plus oxytetracycline/tetracycline plus metronidazole	RR 0.20 95% CI 0.06 to 0.69 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor	● ● ●	doxycycline plus oxytetracycline/tetracycline plus metronidazole
[43] RCT	44 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 20/22 (91%) with amoxicillin/clavulanate 19/22 (86%) with ampicillin (or amoxicillin) plus gentamicin plus metronidazole	RR 1.05 95% CI 0.85 to 1.30 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor	↔	Not significant
[44] RCT	60 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 28/30 (93%) with ampicillin 28/30 (93%) with cefoxitin	RR 1.00 95% CI 0.87 to 1.14 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor	↔	Not significant

Ref (type)	Population	Outcome, Interventions	Results and statistical analysis	Effect size	Favours
[45] RCT	33 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 17/18 (94%) with doxycycline plus amoxicillin/clavulanate 15/15 (100%) with ofloxacin plus amoxicillin/clavulanate	RR 0.94 95% CI 0.84 to 1.06 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor		Not significant
[46] RCT	47 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 22/23 (97%) with ampicillin 18/24 (75%) with doxycycline	RR 1.28 95% CI 1.00 to 1.63 Overall effect size RR 1.05 95% CI 0.91 to 1.22 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor		Not significant
[47] RCT	18 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 9/10 (90%) with ceftriaxone 8/8 (100%) with cefotaxime	RR 0.90 95% CI 0.73 to 1.11 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor		Not significant
[48] RCT	34 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 14/16 (88%) with imipenem plus cilastatin 18/18 (100%) with meropenem	RR 0.88 95% CI 0.73 to 1.05 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor		Not significant
[39] RCT	36 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 16/19 (84%) with cefoxitin 14/17 (82%) with cefotaxime	RR 1.02 95% CI 0.76 to 1.37 Overall effect size RR 0.95 95% CI 0.87 to 1.04 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor		Not significant
[49] RCT	64 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 42/44 (95%) with lymecycline 9/20 (45%) with clindamycin	RR 2.12 95% CI 1.30 to 3.46 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor		lymecycline
[50] RCT	9 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 4/4 (100%) with tobramycin plus metronidazole (spectinomycin) 5/5 (100%) with tobramycin plus clindamycin (spectinomycin)	Overall effect size RR 0.95 RR 0.78 to 1.17 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor		Not significant
[10] RCT	79 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 40/40 (100%) with azithromycin plus metronidazole 38/39 (97%) with azithromycin	RR 0.89 95% CI 0.50 to 1.57 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor		Not significant

Ref (type)	Population	Outcome, Interventions	Results and statistical analysis	Effect size	Favours
	lution included in review				
[51] RCT	36 women In review [21] See further information on studies for full details of population included in review	<b>Cure rate</b> 14/20 (70%) with doxycycline plus metronidazole 15/16 (94%) with ciprofloxacin	RR 0.75 95% CI 0.55 to 1.02 Overall effect size RR 0.80 95% CI 0.52 to 1.24 The review reported that overall trial quality was poor	↔	Not significant
[22] RCT	741 women with PID, without pelvic or tubo-ovarian abscess	<b>Resolution of signs and symptoms , 5 to 24 days post-treatment</b> 262/289 (90.7%) with ofloxacin plus metronidazole 248/275 (90.2%) with moxifloxacin alone	Difference +0.5% 95% CI -5.7% to +4.0% The review reported that overall trial quality was poor	↔	Not significant

### Symptom severity

No data from the following reference on this outcome. [21] [22]

### Rate of ectopic pregnancy

No data from the following reference on this outcome. [21] [22]

### Fertility

No data from the following reference on this outcome. [21] [22]

### Recurrence

No data from the following reference on this outcome. [21] [22]

### Rate of transmission to others

No data from the following reference on this outcome. [21] [22]

### Quality of life

No data from the following reference on this outcome. [21] [22]

## Adverse effects

Ref (type)	Population	Outcome, Interventions	Results and statistical analysis	Effect size	Favours
<b>Adverse effects (global)</b>					
[27] RCT	138 women In review [21]	<b>Adverse effect (any)</b> 52/69 (75%) with ceftriaxone plus doxycycline 57/69 (83%) with ciprofloxacin plus clindamycin	Significance not assessed		
[29] RCT	272 women In review [21]	<b>Adverse effects (any)</b> 20/134 (15%) with cefoxitin plus probenecid plus doxycycline 9/138 (7%) with ofloxacin	Significance not assessed		
[32] RCT	72 women In review [21]	<b>Adverse effects (any)</b> 9/35 (26%) with cefoxitin plus probenecid plus doxycycline 6/37 (26%) with ofloxacin	Significance not assessed		
[41] RCT	81 women In review [21]	<b>Adverse effect (any)</b> 5/42 (12%) with amoxicillin/clavulanate 2/39 (5%) with amoxicillin plus aminoglycoside plus metronidazole	Significance not assessed		
[51] RCT	36 women In review [21]	<b>Adverse effect (any)</b> 11/20 (55%) with doxycycline 3/16 (19%) with metronidazole	Significance not assessed		
[10] RCT	213 women In review [21]	<b>Adverse effect (any)</b> 32/107 (30%) with azithromycin plus metronidazole 26/106 (25%) with azithromycin	Significance not assessed		
[24] RCT	170 women In review [21]	<b>Vestibular disturbance</b> 0/82 (0%) with cefoxitin plus doxycycline 3/88 (3%) with clindamycin plus gentamicin	Significance not assessed		
[24] RCT	120 women In review [21]	<b>Surgical intervention</b> 1/60 (2%) with cefoxitin plus doxycycline 1/60 (2%) with clindamycin plus gentamicin	Significance not assessed		
<b>Withdrawal from treatment owing to adverse effects</b>					
[27] RCT	138 women In review [21]	<b>Withdrawal from treatment</b> 1/69 (1%) with ceftriaxone plus doxycycline 1/69 (1%) with ciprofloxacin plus clindamycin Reason for withdrawal from ceftriaxone plus doxycycline arm given as GI disturbance	Significance not assessed		

Ref (type)	Population	Outcome, Interventions	Results and statistical analysis	Effect size	Favours
[34] RCT	80 women In review [21]	<b>Withdrew from study</b> 0/40 (0%) with clindamycin plus gentamicin 0/40 (0%) with ceftazidime plus doxycycline	Significance not assessed		
[24] RCT	120 women In review [21]	<b>Withdrew from study due to adverse effects</b> 0/60 (0%) with cefoxitin plus doxycycline 1/60 (2%) with clindamycin plus gentamicin Reason for withdrawal from clindamycin plus gentamicin arm given as GI disturbance	Significance not assessed		
[25] RCT	230 women In review [21]	<b>Withdrew from study due to adverse effects</b> 1/114 (1%) with cefoxitin plus doxycycline 0/116 (0%) with clindamycin plus gentamicin Reason for withdrawal from cefoxitin plus doxycycline arm given as GI disturbance	Significance not assessed		
[41] RCT	81 women In review [21]	<b>Withdrawal from treatment due to adverse effects</b> 0/42 (0%) with amoxicillin/clavulanate 1/39 (3%) with amoxicillin plus aminoglycoside plus metronidazole	Significance not assessed		
[45] RCT	33 people In review [21]	<b>Withdrawal from treatment due to adverse effects</b> 0/15 (0%) with amoxicillin/clavulanate 0/18 (0%) with ofloxacin	Significance not assessed		
[51] RCT	36 women In review [21]	<b>Withdrawal from treatment due to adverse effects</b> 0/20 (0%) with doxycycline 0/16 (0%) with metronidazole	Significance not assessed		
[10] RCT	213 women In review [21]	<b>Withdrawn from treatment due to adverse effects</b> 4/107 (4%) with azithromycin plus metronidazole 2/106 (2%) with azithromycin	Significance not assessed		
<b>Angio-oedema</b>					
[41] RCT	81 women In review [21]	<b>Angio-oedema</b> 0/42 (0%) with amoxicillin/clavulanate 1/39 (3%) with amoxicillin plus aminoglycoside plus metronidazole	Significance not assessed		
<b>Allergy</b>					
[28]	148 women	<b>Rash</b>	Significance not assessed		

Ref (type)	Population	Outcome, Interventions	Results and statistical analysis	Effect size	Favours
RCT	In review <sup>[21]</sup>	2/75 (3%) with cefoxitin plus doxycycline 1/75 (1%) with clindamycin plus tobramycin			
<sup>[29]</sup> RCT	272 women In review <sup>[21]</sup>	<b>Rash</b> 1/134 (0.7%) with cefoxitin plus probenecid plus doxycycline 2/138 (1.4%) with ofloxacin	Significance not assessed		
<sup>[26]</sup> RCT	130 women In review <sup>[21]</sup>	<b>Mild rash</b> 1/67 (2%) with cefoxitin plus doxycycline 1/63 (2%) with clindamycin plus gentamicin	Significance not assessed		
<sup>[32]</sup> RCT	72 women In review <sup>[21]</sup>	<b>Allergy</b> 0/35 (0%) with cefoxitin plus probenecid plus doxycycline 1/37 (3%) with ofloxacin	Significance not assessed		
<sup>[35]</sup> RCT	70 women In review <sup>[21]</sup>	<b>Allergies</b> 0/35 (0%) with clindamycin plus gentamicin 2/35 (6%) with ciprofloxacin (plus clindamycin in 1 woman)	Significance not assessed		Favoured intervention favour should be blank
<sup>[43]</sup> RCT	44 women In review <sup>[21]</sup>	<b>Cutaneous allergy</b> 1/22 (5%) with amoxicillin/clavulanate 0/22 (0%) with ampicillin (or amoxicillin) plus gentamicin plus metronidazole	Significance not assessed		
<sup>[25]</sup> RCT	230 women In review <sup>[21]</sup>	<b>Pruritus</b> 2/114 (2%) with cefoxitin plus doxycycline 11/116 (9%) with clindamycin plus gentamicin	Significance not assessed		
<b>Gastrointestinal</b>					
<sup>[24]</sup> RCT	170 women In review <sup>[21]</sup>	<b>Gastrointestinal</b> 10/82 (12%) with cefoxitin plus doxycycline 15/88 (17%) with clindamycin plus gentamicin	Significance not assessed		
<sup>[22]</sup> RCT	741 women	<b>Gastrointestinal</b> 54/378 (14%) with moxifloxacin 71/363 (20%) with ofloxacin plus metronidazole	P = 0.057	↔	Not significant
<sup>[26]</sup> RCT	130 women In review <sup>[21]</sup>	<b>Diarrhoea</b> 2/67 (3%) with cefoxitin plus doxycycline 2/63 (3%) with clindamycin plus gentamicin	Significance not assessed		
<sup>[29]</sup>	272 women	<b>Nausea/vomiting</b>	Significance not assessed		

Ref (type)	Population	Outcome, Interventions	Results and statistical analysis	Effect size	Favours
RCT	In review <sup>[21]</sup>	19/134 (14%) with cefoxitin plus probenecid plus doxycycline 2/138 (1%) with ofloxacin			
<sup>[32]</sup> RCT	72 women In review <sup>[21]</sup>	<b>Nausea/vomiting</b> 3/35 (9%) with cefoxitin plus probenecid plus doxycycline 2/37 (5%) with ofloxacin	Significance not assessed		
<b>Headaches/insomnia</b>					
<sup>[29]</sup> RCT	272 women In review <sup>[21]</sup>	<b>Insomnia</b> 0/134 (0%) with cefoxitin plus probenecid plus doxycycline 2/138 (1%) with ofloxacin	Significance not assessed		
<sup>[32]</sup> RCT	72 women In review <sup>[21]</sup>	<b>Headaches</b> 0/35 (0%) with cefoxitin plus probenecid plus doxycycline 1/37 (3%) with ofloxacin	Significance not assessed		
<b>Candidal vaginitis</b>					
<sup>[29]</sup> RCT	272 women In review <sup>[21]</sup>	<b>Candidal vaginitis</b> 6/134 (4%) with cefoxitin plus probenecid plus doxycycline 5/138 (4%) with ofloxacin	Significance not assessed		
<sup>[32]</sup> RCT	72 women In review <sup>[21]</sup>	<b>Candidal vaginitis</b> 2/35 (6%) with cefoxitin plus probenecid plus doxycycline 1/37 (3%) with ofloxacin	Significance not assessed		
<b>Severe adverse effects</b>					
<sup>[10]</sup> RCT	213 women In review <sup>[21]</sup>	<b>Severe adverse effects</b> 8/107 (7%) with azithromycin plus metronidazole 2/106 (2%) with azithromycin	Significance not assessed		

### Further information on studies

<sup>[21]</sup> The review included women who had been either: diagnosed clinically or laparoscopically with PID; treated with any antibiotic combination; and with an outcome measure of clinical care, microbiological care, infertility, ectopic pregnancy, chronic pelvic pain, or any other relevant outcome. The review made no distinction for severity of disease or between intravenous and oral treatment.

### Comment:

We found one systematic review (search date 1992, 21 studies), which reported on clinical and microbiological cure rates for various antibiotic regimens in the treatment of pelvic inflammatory disease (PID; see [table 3, p 23](#)). <sup>[52]</sup> The review provided aggregated data on indirect comparisons; aspects of the review were subsequently updated (search date 1997, 26 studies, 1925 women). <sup>[53]</sup> The earlier version of the review <sup>[52]</sup> examined all antimicrobial regimens, whereas the updated version <sup>[53]</sup> focused on anti-anaerobic treatment. The identified studies included case series, and it is not possible to ascertain from the aggregated data published how many studies were RCTs. Inclusion criteria were a diagnosis of PID (clinical, microbiological, laparoscopic, or by endometrial

biopsy) and microbiological testing for Chlamydia trachomatis and Neisseria gonorrhoeae. The review found that antibiotics were effective in relieving the symptoms associated with PID, with clinical and microbiological cure rates of 88% to 100% (see [table 2, p 23](#)). The only regimen that seemed to perform less well was oral metronidazole plus doxycycline. However, the studies were of low power, and apparent differences in efficacy may have been confounded by differences in disease severity among studies.

#### Clinical guide:

We found no RCTs comparing antibiotics versus placebo or no treatment. However, such trials would be considered unethical, because there is strong consensus that antibiotic treatments are more effective in women with pelvic inflammatory disease (PID) than no treatment. <sup>[54]</sup> We found little evidence about treatment of PID of differing severity, the effect of ethnicity, or the effects of tracing sexual contacts (see review on partner notification). The risks of tubal occlusion and of subsequent infertility relate to the severity of PID before starting treatment, <sup>[55]</sup> and clinical improvement may not translate into preserved fertility. <sup>[56]</sup> <sup>[57]</sup> The inclusion of observational studies in the older systematic review without a sensitivity analysis may compromise the validity of the conclusions. In the review, reliable comparison of different drugs may be confounded by possible differences in disease severity among the included studies.

### OPTION ORAL ANTIBIOTICS VERSUS PARENTERAL ANTIBIOTICS

- For GRADE evaluation of interventions for Pelvic inflammatory disease, see [table, p 24](#).
- Oral antibiotics may be as effective as parenteral antibiotics in reducing symptoms and preserving fertility, with fewer adverse effects, and outpatient treatment seems as effective as inpatient treatment for uncomplicated PID. However, we don't know the optimal duration.

#### Benefits and harms

##### Oral antibiotics versus parenteral antibiotics:

We found one systematic review <sup>[21]</sup> containing three RCTs that compared oral versus parenteral antibiotic treatment. <sup>[17]</sup> <sup>[29]</sup> <sup>[32]</sup>

#### Cure rate

*Oral antibiotics compared with parenteral antibiotics* Oral antibiotics and parenteral antibiotics may be equally effective at improving cure rate in women with uncomplicated pelvic inflammatory disease (PID) ([moderate-quality evidence](#)).

Ref (type)	Population	Outcome, Interventions	Results and statistical analysis	Effect size	Favours
<b>Cure rate</b>					
<sup>[29]</sup> RCT	249 women with uncomplicated pelvic inflammatory disease (outpatient setting) In review <sup>[21]</sup>	<b>Cure rate</b> with oral ofloxacin with parenteral cefoxitin plus oral doxycycline Absolute results not reported	RR 1.03 95% CI 0.97 to 1.10	↔	Not significant
<sup>[32]</sup> RCT	72 women with uncomplicated acute salpingitis (outpatient setting) In review <sup>[21]</sup>	<b>Cure rate</b> with oral ofloxacin with parenteral cefoxitin plus oral doxycycline Absolute results not reported	RR 0.97 95% CI 0.88 to 1.07	↔	Not significant

No data from the following reference on this outcome. <sup>[17]</sup>

#### Symptom severity


*Oral antibiotics compared with parenteral antibiotics* Oral antibiotics (given as an outpatient treatment) and parenteral antibiotics (given as an inpatient treatment) may be equally effective at improving tenderness, chronic pelvic pain, and endometriosis in women with mild to moderate PID ([low-quality evidence](#)).

Ref (type)	Population	Outcome, Interventions	Results and statistical analysis	Effect size	Favours
<b>Symptom severity</b>					
[17]	831 women with mild to moderate PID In review [21]	<b>Tender on exam , 30 days</b> 69/335 (21%) with single intramuscular dose of cefoxitin plus oral probenecid followed by oral doxycycline (outpatient) 63/324 (18%) with iv cefoxitin plus iv doxycycline followed by oral doxycycline (hospital admission for parenteral antibiotics; inpatient)	P = 0.50	↔	Not significant
[17] RCT	831 women with mild to moderate PID In review [21]	<b>Endometritis (on biopsy) , 30 days</b> 102/222 (46%) with single intramuscular dose of cefoxitin plus oral probenecid followed by oral doxycycline (outpatient) 85/226 (38%) with iv cefoxitin plus iv doxycycline followed by oral doxycycline (hospital admission for parenteral antibiotics; inpatient)	P = 0.09	↔	Not significant
[17] RCT	831 women with mild to moderate PID In review [21]	<b>Tubo-ovarian abscess , 30 days</b> 4/410 (0.9%) with single intramuscular dose of cefoxitin plus oral probenecid followed by oral doxycycline (outpatient) 12/398 (0.7%) with iv cefoxitin plus iv doxycycline followed by oral doxycycline (hospital admission for parenteral antibiotics; inpatient)	Significance not assessed		
[17] RCT	831 women with mild to moderate PID In review [21]	<b>Phlebitis , 30 days</b> 0/410 (0%) with single intramuscular dose of cefoxitin plus oral probenecid followed by oral doxycycline (outpatient) 14/398 (3%) with iv cefoxitin plus iv doxycycline followed by oral doxycycline (hospital admission for parenteral antibiotics; inpatient)	Significance not assessed		
[17] RCT	831 women with mild to moderate PID In review [21]	<b>Chronic pelvic pain , 35 months</b> 128/380 (34%) with single intramuscular dose of cefoxitin plus oral probenecid followed by oral doxycycline (outpatient) 110/369 (30%) with iv cefoxitin plus iv doxycycline followed by oral doxycycline (hospital admission for parenteral antibiotics; inpatient)	OR 1.24 95% CI 0.87 to 1.77	↔	Not significant

No data from the following reference on this outcome. [29] [32]

**Rate of ectopic pregnancy**


*Oral antibiotics compared with parenteral antibiotics* Oral antibiotics (given as an outpatient treatment) and parenteral antibiotics (given as an inpatient treatment) are equally effective at reducing rate of ectopic pregnancy in women with mild to moderate PID ([low-quality evidence](#)).

Ref (type)	Population	Outcome, Interventions	Results and statistical analysis	Effect size	Favours
<b>Rate of ectopic pregnancy</b>					
[17] RCT	831 women with mild to moderate PID In review [21]	<b>Ectopic pregnancy , 35 months</b>  4/410 (1%) with single intramuscular dose of cefoxitin plus oral probenecid followed by oral doxycycline (outpatient)  1/398 (0.3%) with iv cefoxitin plus iv doxycycline followed by oral doxycycline (hospital admission for parenteral antibiotics; inpatient)	OR 3.66  95% CI 0.40 to 33.12		Not significant

No data from the following reference on this outcome. [29] [32]

**Fertility**


*Oral antibiotics compared with parenteral antibiotics* Oral antibiotics (given as an outpatient treatment) and parenteral antibiotics (given as an inpatient treatment) may be equally effective at improving pregnancy or reducing infertility at 35 months in women with mild to moderate PID ([low-quality evidence](#)).

Ref (type)	Population	Outcome, Interventions	Results and statistical analysis	Effect size	Favours
<b>Pregnancy</b>					
[17] RCT	831 women with mild to moderate PID In review [21]	<b>Pregnancy , 35 months</b>  174/410 (42%) with single intramuscular dose of cefoxitin plus oral probenecid followed by oral doxycycline (outpatient)  166/398 (42%) with iv cefoxitin plus iv doxycycline followed by oral doxycycline (hospital admission for parenteral antibiotics; inpatient)	Significance not assessed		
<b>Infertility</b>					
[17] RCT	831 women with mild to moderate PID In review [21]	<b>Infertility , 35 months</b>  71/385 (18.4%) with single intramuscular dose of cefoxitin plus oral probenecid followed by oral doxycycline (outpatient)  67/347 (17.9%) with iv cefoxitin plus iv doxycycline followed by oral doxycycline (hospital admission for parenteral antibiotics; inpatient)	OR 1.32  95% CI 0.86 to 2.04		Not significant

No data from the following reference on this outcome. [29] [32]

**Recurrence**

*Oral antibiotics compared with parenteral antibiotics* Oral antibiotics (given as an outpatient treatment) and parenteral antibiotics (given as an inpatient treatment) may be equally effective at reducing recurrence of PID at 35 months ([low-quality evidence](#)).

Ref (type)	Population	Outcome, Interventions	Results and statistical analysis	Effect size	Favours
<b>Recurrence</b>					
[17] RCT	831 women with mild to moderate PID In review [21]	<b>Recurrent PID , 35 months</b> 51/410 (12%) with single intramuscular dose of cefoxitin plus oral probenecid followed by oral doxycycline (outpatient) 66/398 (17%) with iv cefoxitin plus iv doxycycline followed by oral doxycycline (hospital admission for parenteral antibiotics; inpatient)	OR 0.69 95% CI 0.43 to 1.09		Not significant

No data from the following reference on this outcome. [29] [32]


#### Rate of transmission to others

No data from the following reference on this outcome. [17] [29] [32]

#### Quality of life

No data from the following reference on this outcome. [17] [29] [32]

#### Adverse effects

Ref (type)	Population	Outcome, Interventions	Results and statistical analysis	Effect size	Favours
<b>Adverse effects</b>					
[29] RCT	249 women with uncomplicated pelvic inflammatory disease In review [21]	<b>Adverse effects</b> 7% with oral ofloxacin 15% with parenteral cefoxitin plus oral doxycycline Absolute numbers not reported Adverse effects included nausea, thrombocytosis, candidal vaginitis, eosinophilia, monocytosis, headaches, and allergy	P <0.2		Not significant
[32] RCT	72 women with uncomplicated acute salpingitis In review [21]	<b>Adverse effects</b> 16% with oral ofloxacin 26% with parenteral cefoxitin plus oral doxycycline Absolute numbers not reported Adverse effects included nausea, thrombocytosis, candidal vaginitis, eosinophilia, monocytosis, headaches, and allergy	Significance not assessed		
[17] RCT	831 women with mild to moderate PID In review [21]	<b>Adverse drug reaction</b> 7/410 (1.7%) with single intramuscular dose of cefoxitin plus oral	Significance not assessed		

Ref (type)	Population	Outcome, Interventions	Results and statistical analysis	Effect size	Favours
		probenecid followed by oral doxycycline (outpatient) 6/398 (1.5%) with admission for parenteral antibiotics (inpatient) Types of adverse event not reported			

## Further information on studies

**Comment:** None.

**OPTION      OUTPATIENT VERSUS INPATIENT ANTIBIOTIC TREATMENT**

- For GRADE evaluation of interventions for Pelvic inflammatory disease, [see table, p 24](#) .
- Oral antibiotics may be as effective as parenteral antibiotics in reducing symptoms and preserving fertility, with fewer adverse effects, and outpatient treatment is as effective as inpatient treatment for uncomplicated PID. However, we don't know the optimal duration.

## Benefits and harms

**Outpatient versus inpatient antibiotic treatment:**

See option on oral versus parenteral antibiotic treatment, p 13 .

## Further information on studies

**Comment:**      **Clinical guide:**

Parenteral treatment as an inpatient offers no advantage over outpatient treatment in women with mild to moderate pelvic inflammatory disease (defined as the absence of a tubo-ovarian abscess).

**OPTION      DIFFERENT DURATIONS OF ANTIBIOTIC TREATMENT**

- For GRADE evaluation of interventions for Pelvic inflammatory disease, [see table, p 24](#) .
- Oral antibiotics may be as effective as parenteral antibiotics in reducing symptoms and preserving fertility, with fewer adverse effects, and outpatient treatment is as effective as inpatient treatment for uncomplicated PID. However, we don't know the optimal duration of treatment.
- We found no direct information about optimal durations of antibiotic treatment in women with PID. A 14-day treatment course is currently recommended.

## Benefits and harms

**Different durations of antibiotics versus each other:**

We identified two systematic reviews that assessed the effects of different antibiotic regimens in the treatment of PID. <sup>[21]</sup> <sup>[53]</sup> Neither review assessed the effect of duration of treatment on clinical outcomes, although the most common treatment period was 14 days.

## Adverse effects

Ref (type)	Population	Outcome, Interventions	Results and statistical analysis	Effect size	Favours
<b>Adverse effects</b>					
[53] Systematic review	Number of people not reported	<b>Adverse effects , 2 weeks</b> with metronidazole plus doxycycline with The review reported that significant adverse effects such as pseudomembranous colitis, neuropathy, and drug reactions occur rarely (0.1–0.5% of cases), and that minor adverse effects such as nausea, flushing, and metallic taste, occur in 30% to 50% of people after two weeks' treatment with metronidazole plus doxycycline			

No data from the following reference on this outcome. <sup>[21]</sup>

## Further information on studies

## Comment:

## Clinical guide:

A 14-day treatment course is recommended for pelvic inflammatory disease based on the current evidence.

## QUESTION

What are the effects of routine antibiotic prophylaxis to prevent pelvic inflammatory disease before IUD insertion?

## OPTION

ROUTINE ANTIBIOTIC PROPHYLAXIS BEFORE IUD INSERTION IN WOMEN AT HIGH RISK

- For GRADE evaluation of interventions for Pelvic inflammatory disease, [see table, p 24](#).
- We found no direct information from RCTs about antibiotic prophylaxis before IUD insertion in women at high risk of pelvic inflammatory disease.
- Risks of PID may be increased after instrumentation of the cervix, and testing for infection before such procedures is advisable, but we don't know whether prophylactic antibiotics before IUD insertion reduce these risks.

## Benefits and harms

## Antibiotic prophylaxis before IUD insertion in women at high risk:

We found no RCTs on the effects of routine antibiotic prophylaxis in women at high risk of pelvic inflammatory disease.

## Further information on studies

# Pelvic inflammatory disease

**Comment:** Nausea and vomiting has been reported with 17% to 28% of healthy volunteers on doxycycline, depending on the formulation given. <sup>[58]</sup> See [harms of antibiotics \(for symptoms and microbiological clearance in women with confirmed pelvic inflammatory disease\)](#), p 3 .

## OPTION ROUTINE ANTIBIOTIC PROPHYLAXIS BEFORE IUD INSERTION IN WOMEN AT LOW RISK

- For GRADE evaluation of interventions for Pelvic inflammatory disease, see [table, p 24](#) .
- Risks of PID may be increased after instrumentation of the cervix, and testing for infection before such procedures is advisable, but prophylactic antibiotics in women at low risk of PID seem no more effective than placebo at reducing rate of PID.

### Benefits and harms

#### Antibiotic prophylaxis before IUD insertion versus no antibiotic prophylaxis (in women at low risk):

We found one systematic review (search date 2002, 4 RCTs, 3598 women requesting IUD insertion). <sup>[59]</sup>

#### Rate of PID

*Antibiotic prophylaxis compared with placebo* Antibiotic prophylaxis before IUD insertion is no more effective than placebo at reducing the incidence of pelvic inflammatory disease in women at low risk of pelvic inflammatory disease ([moderate-quality evidence](#)).

Ref (type)	Population	Outcome, Interventions	Results and statistical analysis	Effect size	Favours
<b>Rate of PID</b>					
<sup>[59]</sup> Systematic review	3598 women requesting IUD insertion 4 RCTs in this analysis	<b>Incidence of PID</b> with single dose of doxycycline 200 mg (1 hour before IUD insertion) with placebo (1 hour before IUD insertion) Absolute results not reported The rate of PID in all women was low (0.5–1.6%), regardless of whether they received antibiotics, suggesting that this was a low-risk group	OR 0.89 95% CI 0.53 to 1.51 The wide confidence interval suggests that the study may have lacked power to detect a clinically important difference	↔	Not significant

No data from the following reference on this outcome. <sup>[59]</sup>

### Further information on studies

**Comment:** Nausea and vomiting has been reported with 17% to 28% of healthy volunteers on doxycycline, depending on the formulation given. <sup>[58]</sup> See [harms of antibiotics \(for symptoms and microbiological clearance in women with confirmed pelvic inflammatory disease\)](#), p 3 .

#### Clinical guide:

In the populations included in the systematic review, the risk of pelvic inflammatory disease (PID) after IUD insertion was low. <sup>[59]</sup> The occurrence of PID in this group usually reflects the introduction of infection into the uterus during IUD insertion, and will therefore vary with the prevalence of STDs in the population. A further systematic review also found that the absolute risk of PID was low even when gonorrhoea or chlamydia was present at the time of IUD insertion (0–5% for those with an STD compared with 0–2% in those without an STD). <sup>[60]</sup>

## GLOSSARY

**Low-quality evidence** Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.

**Moderate-quality evidence** Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.

**Very low-quality evidence** Any estimate of effect is very uncertain.

## SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES

**Antibiotics (for symptoms and microbiological clearance in women with confirmed pelvic inflammatory disease)** One RCT added;<sup>[22]</sup> benefits and harms data enhanced, categorisation unchanged (Likely to be beneficial).

## REFERENCES

- Morcos R, Frost N, Hnat M, et al. Laparoscopic versus clinical diagnosis of acute pelvic inflammatory disease. *J Reprod Med* 1993;38:53–56.[PubMed]
- Metters JS, Catchpole M, Smith C, et al. *Chlamydia trachomatis: summary and conclusions of CMO's expert advisory group*. London: Department of Health, 1998.
- Centers for Disease Control. 2002 guidelines for treatment of sexually transmitted diseases. Bethesda, Maryland: CDC, 1998, 2002. <http://www.cdc.gov/std/treatment/TOC2002TG.htm> (last accessed 04 August 2010).
- Sutton MY, Stenberg M, Zaida A, et al. Trends in pelvic inflammatory disease hospital discharges and ambulatory visits, United States 1985–2001. *Sex Trans Dis* 2005;32:778–784.
- Simms I, Rogers P, Charlett A. The rate of diagnosis and demography of pelvic inflammatory disease in general practice: England and Wales. *Int J STD AIDS* 1999;10:448–455.[PubMed]
- Velebil P, Wingo PA, Xia Z, et al. Rate of hospitalization for gynecologic disorders among reproductive-age women in the United States. *Obstet Gynecol* 1995;86:764–769.[PubMed]
- Kani J, Adler MW. Epidemiology of pelvic inflammatory disease. In: Berger GS, Westrom L, eds. *Inflammatory disease*. New York: Raven Press, 1992.
- Simms I, Catchpole M, Brugha R, et al. Epidemiology of genital *Chlamydia trachomatis* in England and Wales. *Genitourin Med* 1997;73:122–126.[PubMed]
- Grodstein F, Rothman KJ. Epidemiology of pelvic inflammatory disease. *Epidemiology* 1994;5:234–242.[PubMed]
- Bevan CD, Johal BJ, Mumtaz G, et al. Clinical, laparoscopic and microbiological findings in acute salpingitis: report on a United Kingdom cohort. *Br J Obstet Gynaecol* 1995;102:407–414.[PubMed]
- Ross JD. Is *Mycoplasma genitalium* a cause of pelvic inflammatory disease? *Infect Dis Clin North Am* 2005;19:407–413.[PubMed]
- Wolner-Hanssen P, Eschenbach DA, Paavonen J, et al. Association between vaginal douching and acute pelvic inflammatory disease. *JAMA* 1990;263:1936–1941.[PubMed]
- Jacobson L, Westrom L. Objectivized diagnosis of acute pelvic inflammatory disease. Diagnostic and prognostic value of routine laparoscopy. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 1969;105:1088–1098.[PubMed]
- Kelaghan J, Rubin GL, Ory HW, et al. Barrier-method contraceptives and pelvic inflammatory disease. *JAMA* 1982;248:184–187.[PubMed]
- Wolner-Hanssen P, Eschenbach DA, Paavonen J, et al. Decreased risk of symptomatic chlamydial pelvic inflammatory disease associated with oral contraceptive use. *JAMA* 1990;263:54–59.[PubMed]
- Sivin I. Risks and benefits, advantages and disadvantages of levonorgestrel-releasing contraceptive implants. *Drug Saf* 2003;26:303–335.[PubMed]
- Ness RB, Soper DE, Holley RL, et al. Effectiveness of inpatient and outpatient treatment strategies for women with pelvic inflammatory disease: results from the Pelvic Inflammatory Disease Evaluation and Clinical Health (PEACH) Randomized Trial. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2002;186:929–937.[PubMed]
- Ness RB, Trautmann G, Richter HE, et al. Effectiveness of treatment strategies of some women with pelvic inflammatory disease: a randomized trial. *Obstet Gynecol* 2005;106:573–580. [Erratum in *Obstet Gynecol* 2006;107:1423–1425][PubMed]
- Hillis SD, Owens LM, Marchbanks PA, et al. Recurrent chlamydial infections increase the risks of hospitalization for ectopic pregnancy and pelvic inflammatory disease. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 1997;176:103–107.[PubMed]
- Hillis SD, Joesoef R, Marchbanks PA, et al. Delayed care of pelvic inflammatory disease as a risk factor for impaired fertility. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 1993;168:1503–1509.[PubMed]
- Meads C, Knight T, Hyde C, et al. The clinical effectiveness and cost effectiveness of antibiotic regimens for pelvic inflammatory disease, 2004. West Midlands Health Technology Assessment Collaboration.
- Ross JD, Cronje HS, Paszkowski T, et al. Moxifloxacin versus ofloxacin plus metronidazole in uncomplicated pelvic inflammatory disease: results of a multicentre, double blind, randomised trial. *Sex Transm Infect* 2006;82:446–451.[PubMed]
- Hoyme UBA. Quinolones in the treatment of uncomplicated salpingitis: Ofloxacin/metronidazole vs. gentamicin/clindamycin. *Archives of Gynecology and Obstetrics* 1993;254:607–608.
- Dublanche M. Comparative evaluation of clindamycin/gentamicin and cefoxitin/doxycycline for treatment of pelvic inflammatory disease: A multi-center trial. The European Study Group. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand* 1992;71:129–134.[PubMed]
- Hemsel DL, Little BB, Faro S, et al. Comparison of three regimens recommended by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for the treatment of women hospitalized with acute pelvic inflammatory disease. *Clin Infect Dis* 1994;19:720–727.[PubMed]
- Walters MDG. A randomized comparison of gentamicin-clindamycin and cefoxitin-doxycline in the treatment of acute pelvic inflammatory disease. *Obstet Gynecol* 1990;75:867–872.[PubMed]
- Arredondo JLD. Oral clindamycin and ciprofloxacin versus intramuscular ceftriaxone and oral doxycycline in the treatment of mild-to-moderate pelvic inflammatory disease in outpatients. *Clin Infect Dis* 1997;24:170–178.[PubMed]
- Landers DVW. Combination antimicrobial therapy in the treatment of acute pelvic inflammatory disease. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 1991;164:849–858.[PubMed]
- Martens MG, Gordon S, Yarborough DR, et al. Multicenter randomized trial of ofloxacin versus cefoxitin and doxycycline in outpatient treatment of pelvic inflammatory disease. Ambulatory PID Research Group. *South Med J* 1993;86:604–610.[PubMed]
- Soper DE, Despres B, Soper DE, et al. A comparison of two antibiotic regimens for treatment of pelvic inflammatory disease. *Obstet Gynecol* 1988;72:7–12.[PubMed]
- American Society for Microbiology. Treatment of acute PID: Cefoxitin plus doxycycline versus clindamycin plus tobramycin. Minneapolis, Minnesota, Twenty fifth Interscience Conference on Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy, Washington DC: American Society for Microbiology; 29th October 1985.
- Wendel GD, Cox SM, Bawdon RE, et al. A randomized trial of ofloxacin versus cefoxitin and doxycycline in the outpatient treatment of acute salpingitis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 1991;164:1390–1396.[PubMed]
- Apuzzo JJ, Stankiewicz R, Ganesh V, et al. Comparison of parenteral ciprofloxacin with clindamycin-gentamicin in the treatment of pelvic infection. *Am J Med* 1989;87:148S–151S.[PubMed]
- Balbi G, Piscitelli V. Acute pelvic inflammatory disease: Compared therapeutical protocols. *Minerva Ginecol* 1996;48:19–23.[PubMed]
- Crombleholme WR, Schachter J, Ohm-Smith M, et al. Efficacy of single-agent therapy for the treatment of acute pelvic inflammatory disease with ciprofloxacin. *Am J Med* 1989;87:142S–147S.[PubMed]
- Hemsel DL, Martens MG, Faro S, et al. A multicenter study comparing intravenous meropenem with clindamycin plus gentamicin for the treatment of acute gynecologic and obstetric pelvic infections in hospitalized women. *Clin Infect Dis* 1997;24 Suppl 2:S222–S230.[PubMed]
- Henry SA, Henry SA. Overall clinical experience with aztreonam in the treatment of obstetric-gynecologic infections. *Rev Infect Dis* 1985;7 Suppl 4:S703–S708.[PubMed]
- Larsen JW, Gabel-Hughes K, Kreter B, et al. Efficacy and tolerability of imipenem-cilastatin versus clindamycin+gentamicin for serious pelvic infections. *Clin Ther* 1992;14:90–96.[PubMed]
- Martens MG, Faro S, Hammill H, et al. Comparison of cefotaxime, cefoxitin and clindamycin plus gentamicin in the treatment of uncomplicated and complicated pelvic inflammatory disease. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 1990;26:37–43.[PubMed]
- Thadepalli H, Mathai D, Scotti R, et al. Ciprofloxacin monotherapy for acute pelvic infections: a comparison with clindamycin plus gentamicin. *Obstet Gynecol* 1991;78:696–702.[PubMed]
- Buisson P, Mulard C, Baudet J, et al. [Treatment of upper genital infections in women. Multicenter study of the comparative efficacy and tolerance of an amoxicillin-clavulanic acid combination and of a triple antibiotic combination]. [French]. *Rev Fr Gynecol Obstet* 1989;84:699–703.[PubMed]
- Burchell HJ, Cronje HS, de Wet JI, et al. Efficacy of different antibiotics in the treatment of pelvic inflammatory disease. *S Afr J Surg* 1987;72:248–249.[PubMed]
- Ciraru-Vigneron N, Bercau G, Sauvanet E, et al. [The drug combination amoxicillin-clavulanic acid compared to the triple combination ampicillin-gentamicin-metronidazole in the treatment of severe adnexal infections]. [French]. *Pathol Biol (Paris)* 1986;34:665–668.[PubMed]
- De Beer JAA, V. Efficacy of ampicillin and cefoxitin in the treatment of acute pelvic inflammatory disease. A comparative study. *S Afr J Surg* 1983;64:733–735.[PubMed]
- Judlin P, Koebele A, Zaccabri A, et al. [Comparative study of ofloxacin+amoxicillin-clavulanic acid versus doxycycline+amoxicillin-clavulanic acid combination in the treatment of pelvic Chlamydia trachomatis infections]. [French]. *J Gynecol Obstet Biol Reprod (Paris)* 1995;24:253–259.[PubMed]
- Spence MRG. Randomized prospective comparison of ampicillin and doxycycline in the treatment of acute pelvic inflammatory disease in hospitalized patients. *Sex Transm Dis* 1981;8:164–166.
- Gerstner GJ. Comparison of ceftriaxone (1 x 1 g/day) versus cefotaxime (3 x 1 g/day) for gynecologic and obstetric infections. A randomized clinical trial. *Gynecol Obstet Invest* 1990;29:273–277.

48. Maggioni P, Di Stefano F, Facchini V, et al. Treatment of obstetric and gynecologic infections with meropenem: comparison with imipenem/cilastatin. *J Chemother* 1998;10:114–121. [PubMed]
49. Gjonnaess HDalaker. Treatment of pelvic inflammatory disease. Effects of lymecycline and clindamycin. *Curr Ther Res Clin Exp* 1981;29:885–892.
50. Gall SA, Kohan AP, Ayers OM, et al. Intravenous metronidazole or clindamycin with tobramycin for therapy of pelvic infections. *Obstet Gynecol* 1981;57:51–58. [PubMed]
51. Heinonen PKT. A comparison of ciprofloxacin with doxycycline plus metronidazole in the treatment of acute pelvic inflammatory disease. *Scand J Infect Dis Suppl* 1989;21:66–73. [PubMed]
52. Walker CK, Kahn JG, Washington AE, et al. Pelvic inflammatory disease: meta-analysis of antimicrobial regimen efficacy. *J Infect Dis* 1993;168:969–978. Search date 1992; primary sources Medline, and bibliographies from reviews, textbooks, and references. [PubMed]
53. Walker CK, Workowski KA, Washington AE, et al. Anaerobes in pelvic inflammatory disease: implications for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's guidelines for treatment of sexually transmitted diseases. *Clin Infect Dis* 1999;28(suppl):29–36. Search date 1997; primary sources Medline, and bibliographies from reviews, textbooks, and references.
54. Ross JD. United Kingdom national guidelines for the management of pelvic inflammatory disease. British Association for Sexual Health and HIV Clinical Effectiveness Group (BASHH). Available online at <http://www.bashh.org/guidelines.asp> (last accessed 03 August 2010).
55. Soper DE, Brockwell NJ, Dalton HP. Microbial etiology of urban emergency department acute salpingitis: treatment with ofloxacin. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 1992;167:653–660. [PubMed]
56. Buchan H, Vessey M, Goldacre M, et al. Morbidity following pelvic inflammatory disease. *Br J Obstet Gynaecol* 1993;100:558–562. [PubMed]
57. Brunham RC, Binns B, Guijon F, et al. Etiology and outcome of acute pelvic inflammatory disease. *J Infect Dis* 1988;158:510–517. [PubMed]
58. Story MJ, McCloud PI, Boehm G. Doxycycline tolerance study. Incidence of nausea after doxycycline administration to healthy volunteers: a comparison of 2 formulations (Doryx® vs Vibramycin®). *Eur J Clin Pharmacol* 1991;40:419–421. [PubMed]
59. Grimes DA, Schulz KF. Antibiotic prophylaxis for intrauterine contraceptive device insertion. In: The Cochrane Library, Issue 4, 2002. Oxford: Update Software. Search date 2000; primary sources Medline, Popline, Embase, lists of references, and contacted experts in the field.
60. Mohllajee AP, Curtis KM, Peterson HB. Does insertion and use of an intrauterine device increase the risk of pelvic inflammatory disease among women with sexually transmitted infection? A systematic review. *Contraception* 2006;73:145–153. [PubMed]

**Jonathan D C Ross**  
Professor of Sexual Health and HIV  
Whittall Street Clinic  
Birmingham  
UK

Competing interests: JR has received consultancy fees from Bayer Pharma in addition to funds to support research and education.

## Disclaimer

The information contained in this publication is intended for medical professionals. Categories presented in Clinical Evidence indicate a judgement about the strength of the evidence available to our contributors prior to publication and the relevant importance of benefit and harms. We rely on our contributors to confirm the accuracy of the information presented and to adhere to describe accepted practices. Readers should be aware that professionals in the field may have different opinions. Because of this and regular advances in medical research we strongly recommend that readers' independently verify specified treatments and drugs including manufacturers' guidance. Also, the categories do not indicate whether a particular treatment is generally appropriate or whether it is suitable for a particular individual. Ultimately it is the readers' responsibility to make their own professional judgements, so to appropriately advise and treat their patients. To the fullest extent permitted by law, BMJ Publishing Group Limited and its editors are not responsible for any losses, injury or damage caused to any person or property (including under contract, by negligence, products liability or otherwise) whether they be direct or indirect, special, incidental or consequential, resulting from the application of the information in this publication.

**TABLE 1** RCTs comparing outpatient versus inpatient antibiotic treatment for PID at different follow-up periods (see text, p 3 ).<sup>[17]</sup> <sup>[18]</sup>

Ref	Population	Recurrence	Chronic pelvic pain	Infertility	Ectopic pregnancy
<sup>[17]</sup>	831 women with mild to moderate PID; 808 followed up to 35 months; inpatients v outpatients	12% v 17%; OR 0.69, 95% CI 0.43 to 1.09	34% v 30%; OR 1.24, 95% CI 0.87 to 1.77	18.4% v 17.9%; OR 1.32, 95% CI 0.86 to 2.04	1.0% v 0.3%; OR 3.66, 95% CI 0.40 to 33.12
<sup>[18]</sup>	As above; 541 followed up to 84 months; inpatients v outpatients	18% v 24%; OR 0.71, 95% CI 0.48 to 1.05	41% v 45%; OR 1.21, 95% CI 0.87 to 1.67	17% v 21%; OR 0.88, 95% CI 0.59 to 1.32	1.2% v 0.2%; OR 4.91, 95% CI 0.57 to 42.25

PID, pelvic inflammatory disease

**TABLE 2** Standard antibiotic regimens and corresponding trial evidence (see text, p 3 ).<sup>[21]</sup>

Regimen	Trial evidence available
Oral ofloxacin 800 mg daily plus oral metronidazole 800 g daily for 14 days	Ofloxacin plus metronidazole v clindamycin plus gentamicin
im ceftriaxone 250 mg once or im cefoxitin 2 g once plus oral probenecid 1 g once followed by oral doxycycline 200 mg daily plus oral metronidazole 800 mg daily for 14 days	Cefoxitin plus doxycycline v cefoxitin plus probenecid plus doxycycline
im ceftriaxone 250 mg or im cefoxitin 2 g plus oral probenecid 1 g or a third-generation cephalosporin plus oral doxycycline 200 mg for 14 days	Ceftriaxone or cefoxitin plus oral probenecid or a third-generation cephalosporin plus oral doxycycline v non-standard treatments
iv cefoxitin 6 g daily plus iv (or oral) doxycycline 200 mg daily followed by oral doxycycline 200 mg daily plus oral metronidazole 800 mg daily to complete 14 days	Cefoxitin plus doxycycline v clindamycin plus gentamicin, cefoxitin plus doxycycline v cefoxitin plus probenecid plus doxycycline
iv clindamycin 2.7 g daily plus iv gentamicin 2 mg/kg loading dose then 4.5 mg/kg daily followed by either oral doxycycline 200 mg daily plus oral metronidazole 200 mg daily or oral clindamycin 1.8 g daily to complete 14 days	Ofloxacin plus metronidazole v clindamycin plus gentamicin, cefoxitin plus doxycycline v clindamycin plus gentamicin, iv clindamycin plus gentamicin followed by either oral doxycycline plus oral metronidazole or oral clindamycin v non-standard treatments
iv ofloxacin 800 mg daily plus iv metronidazole 1.5 g daily for 14 days	Ofloxacin plus metronidazole v clindamycin plus gentamicin
iv ciprofloxacin 400 mg daily plus iv (or oral) doxycycline 200 mg daily plus iv metronidazole 1.5 g daily (unspecified length, presume 14 days)	No RCT comparisons
im, intramuscular; iv, intravenous	

**TABLE 3** Cure rates for the antibiotic treatment of acute PID: aggregated data from a systematic review of RCTs and case series (see text, p 3 ).<sup>[52] [53]</sup>

Drug regimen	Number of studies	Number of women	Cure rate (%)	
			Clinical	Microbiological*
Inpatient treatment (initially parenteral switching to oral)				
Clindamycin plus aminoglycoside	11	470	91	97
Cefoxitin plus doxycycline	8	427	91	98
Cefotetan plus doxycycline	3	174	95	100
Ceftizoxime plus tetracycline	1	18	88	100
Cefotaxime plus tetracycline	1	19	94	100
Ciprofloxacin	4	90	94	96
Ofloxacin	1	36	100	97
Sulbactam/ampicillin plus doxycycline	1	37	95	100
Co-amoxiclav	1	32	93	—
Metronidazole plus doxycycline	2	36	75	71
Outpatient treatment (oral unless indicated otherwise)				
Cefoxitin (im) plus probenecid plus doxycycline	3	219	89	93
Ofloxacin	2	165	95	100
Co-amoxiclav	1	35	100	100
Sulbactam/ampicillin	1	36	70	70
Ceftriaxone (im) plus doxycycline	1	64	95	100
Ciprofloxacin plus clindamycin	1	67	97	94
*Neisseria gonorrhoeae, Chlamydia trachomatis, or both, when detected in lower genital tract; im, intramuscular; PID, pelvic inflammatory disease				

\**Neisseria gonorrhoeae*, *Chlamydia trachomatis*, or both, when detected in lower genital tract; im, intramuscular; PID, pelvic inflammatory disease

**GRADE** Evaluation of interventions for Pelvic inflammatory disease.

Important outcomes	Cure rate, Fertility, Quality of life, Rate of ectopic pregnancy, Rate of PID, Rate of transmission to others, Recurrence, Symptom severity								
Studies (Participants)	Outcome	Comparison	Type of evidence	Quality	Consistency	Directness	Effect size	GRADE	Comment
<i>How do different antimicrobial regimens compare when treating women with confirmed pelvic inflammatory disease?</i>									
at least 35 RCTs (at least 4289 women) <sup>[21] [22]</sup>	Cure rate	Different antibiotics versus each other	4	−2	0	−1	0	Very low	Quality points deducted for inclusion of observational studies and for poor quality studies. Directness point deducted for differences in disease severity
2 (321) <sup>[29] [32]</sup>	Cure rate	Oral antibiotics versus parenteral antibiotics	4	−1	0	−1	0	Low	Quality point deducted for incomplete reporting of results. Directness point deducted for inclusion of oral antibiotics in parenteral arm
1 (831) <sup>[17]</sup>	Symptom severity	Oral antibiotics versus parenteral antibiotics	4	−1	0	−1	0	Low	Quality point deducted for no statistical assessment. Directness point deducted for inclusion of intramuscular injection in outpatient arm and oral antibiotics in parenteral arm
1 (831) <sup>[17]</sup>	Rate of ectopic pregnancy	Oral antibiotics versus parenteral antibiotics	4	−1	0	−1	0	Low	Quality point deducted for no statistical assessment. Directness point deducted for inclusion of intramuscular injection in outpatient arm
1 (831) <sup>[17]</sup>	Fertility	Oral antibiotics versus parenteral antibiotics	4	−1	0	−1	0	Low	Quality point deducted for no statistical assessment for some outcomes. Directness point deducted for inclusion of intramuscular injection in outpatient arm
1 (831) <sup>[17]</sup>	Recurrence	Oral antibiotics versus parenteral antibiotics	4	−1	0	−1	0	Low	Quality point deducted for no statistical assessment. Directness point deducted for inclusion of intramuscular injection in outpatient arm
<i>What are the effects of routine antibiotic prophylaxis to prevent pelvic inflammatory disease before IUD insertion?</i>									
4 (3598) <sup>[59]</sup>	Rate of PID	Antibiotic prophylaxis before IUD insertion versus no antibiotic prophylaxis (in women at low risk)	4	−1	0	0	0	Moderate	Quality point deducted for incomplete reporting of results
We initially allocate 4 points to evidence from RCTs, and 2 points to evidence from observational studies. To attain the final GRADE score for a given comparison, points are deducted or added from this initial score based on preset criteria relating to the categories of quality, directness, consistency, and effect size. Quality: based on issues affecting methodological rigour (e.g., incomplete reporting of results, quasi-randomisation, sparse data [ $<200$ people in the analysis]). Consistency: based on similarity of results across studies. Directness: based on generalisability of population or outcomes. Effect size: based on magnitude of effect as measured by statistics such as relative risk, odds ratio, or hazard ratio.									